

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Donna Riley, in her capacity as the Treasurer-Tax  
Collector of Stanislaus County,

Plaintiff,

v.

Lloyd G. Ploutz,  
Seeger Industries, Inc.,  
Granada Park Homeowner's Association,  
William R. Morehead,  
United States Internal Revenue Service,  
State of California Franchise Tax Board,  
City of Modesto, and  
Does 1–25, inclusive,

Defendants.

United States of America

Cross-Complainant,

v.

Lloyd G. Ploutz

Cross-Defendant

Case No. 1:20-cv-01177-DAD-EPG

ORDER, GRANTING IN PART,  
DENYING IN PART, EXTENSION

(ECF No. 84)

1 This matter is before the Court on the Statement and Request for Extension filed by the  
2 United States, which asks for an extension of time from the February 15, 2022 deadline to file an  
3 appropriate dispositional document under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41, or, alternatively,  
4 to file a joint report proposing a case schedule for the case going forward. (ECF Nos. 82, 84). As  
5 grounds, the United States notes the recently filed motion for summary judgment against Cross-  
6 Defendant Lloyd G. Ploutz and states that “[t]he tentative settlement among the parties could be  
7 impacted by the ruling on the Motion for Summary Judgment” and that “the parties are unable to  
8 finalize their agreement until the outcome of the motion is known.” (ECF No. 84, pp. 2-3; *see*  
9 ECF No. 81).

10 Having considered the Statement and Request, IT IS ORDERED that the request for  
11 additional time is granted in part and denied in part. (ECF No. 84) No later than thirty days after  
12 the District Judge has ruled on the United States’ Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 81),  
13 the parties shall, if able to finalize their agreement, file an appropriate dispositional document  
14 resolving the remainder of the case under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41.

15 However, the Court will not extend the time for the parties to file a joint report proposing  
16 a case schedule for the case going forward. (ECF No. 59). Given that the parties have not  
17 proposed a revised case schedule at this time, the case will proceed according to the schedule  
18 already set.

19 \\\

20 \\\

21 \\\

22 \\\

1 If the parties seek to modify the schedule going forward, they may file a stipulation or  
2 motion explaining any good cause for such extension at that time.

3  
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: **February 7, 2022**

/s/ Eric P. Grogan  
6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE